



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/633,778	08/07/2000	Koichi Takeuchi	2257-0156P-SP	3857

2292 7590 03/19/2007  
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
----------

SHELEHEDA, JAMES R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
2 MONTHS	03/19/2007	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 2 MONTHS from 03/19/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**MAILED**

**MAR 19 2007**

**Technology Center 2600**

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/633,778  
Filing Date: August 07, 2000  
Appellant(s): TAKEUCHI, KOICHI

---

Takeuchi, Koichi  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 11/07/06 appealing from the Office action  
mailed 02/08/06.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The amendment after final rejection filed on 06/7/06 has been entered.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

Art Unit: 2623

The copy of the appealed claims contained in Appendix A2, directed to the entered amendment dated 06/07/06 is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6,016,348	Blatter et al.	01-2000
5,909,257	Ohishi et al.	06-1999
6,604,243	Freimann	8-2003

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1, 6, 8-11, 16, 20, 25, 27-30, 33, 35, 36 and 38-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blatter et al. in view of Ohishi et al. This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on February 08, 2006.

Claims 7, 14, 15, 19, 26, 31, 32, 34, 37, 42 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blatter et al. and Ohishi et al. in view of Freimann. This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on February 08, 2006.

**(10) Response to Argument**

a. On page 11, appellant argues that there is no disclosure of substituting a specific value for a PID value to generate a PMT, as Ohishi generates PSSIs, not new PMTs.

In response, as indicated in the previous rejections, Ohishi discloses taking a PMT table, altering the data to have new PID values and then generating a new table containing the altered PID values (column 11, line 35-column 12, line 14). The mere fact that Ohishi gives the newly created table a new name (PSSI) does not negate the basic fact that this is the same table as the PMT and is utilized for the same purpose of identifying the PIDs where the video and audio of the program are located (see column 11, line 35-column 12, line 14 and Figs. 18 and 19). As seen in a comparison of Fig. 6C and Fig. 18, the PMT for a program (indicated in Fig. 6C and column 6, lines 15-21) and the PSSI for a recorded program (Fig. 18 and column 11, lines 29-65) clearly include the same data information and are further utilized for the exact same purpose, i.e. selection and display of a program (column 12, lines 34-58 and column 13, lines 5-18). Simply providing a unique name for the newly generated table, thus differentiating it from the previous PMT, does not alter the fact that they are in fact identical tables containing the same data, and thereby qualifying as a new "PMT" for the program.

Furthermore, in response to appellant's arguments on pages 11-13, it is noted that Blatter specifically discloses a recording system wherein PSIP tables for television programs are received (column 8, lines 18-61) which further specifically includes PMTs (column 8, lines 18-61). As further disclosed by Blatter, recording of a television program results in the recording of a PMT for

Art Unit: 2623

that specific program (recording of the PSIP data for just the specified program as opposed to all of the data; column 8, lines 8-17 and column 9, lines 33-61). Thus, while Blatter discloses the selective modification and recording the PSIP data, he does not specifically disclose modification of the PMT for a recorded program.

Ohishi was then relied upon to disclose a system for recording programs wherein the PMT for a program is modified to generate a new table with altered values (renamed to a PSSI table; column 11, lines 30-65).

Thus, as previously indicated, the combination of Blatter and Ohishi then provide a system wherein a PMT directed to the recorded program is then recorded with modified PID values.

b. On page 13, appellant argues that Blatter fails to disclose modifying a PAT table for a program, and further that modification of a CAT table was relied upon as disclosing this feature.

In response, it is noted that, as indicated in the rejections, Blatter discloses a system wherein program information pertaining *only* to a recorded program is stored (column 8, lines 7-17 and column 9, lines 33-61). Blatter further specifically discloses modifying *some* tables (such as a CAT) as needed (column 8, lines 35-37 and column 9, lines 43-46). Thus, while Blatter specifically discloses a desire for storing data pertaining to only recorded programs and the ability to modify tables, he fails to specifically disclose

modifying the PAT. Ohishi discloses a system wherein the PAT is modified to reflect only programs selected for recording (column 7, line 48-column 8, line 7). This is further explicitly described as beneficial as Ohishi describes conventional STBs as requiring all PMTs indicated in a PAT as being required. Thus, Ohishi's modification of the PAT would enable the storage of less information, as PMTs for unwanted programs would not have to be recorded, which is a specific desire of Blatter (as Blatter indicates a desire to reduce overhead and storage requirements for the table information; see Blatter at column 8, lines 7-17).

c. On pages 13-14, appellant argues that Blatter and Ohishi fail to disclose recording a program information index based on information in various tables, as appellant feels that the full PSI is received intact.

In response, it is noted that Blatter specifically discloses utilizing PSI tables as described in the MPEG standard. The PSI, as utilized by a receiver, is made up of a plurality of tables and sub-tables which allow the receiver to correctly tune to a program. The full PSI is not transmitted "intact" as appellant suggests, as a basic operation of the standard is that the different tables are all transmitted at different times and transmission intervals. When a receiver is first connected to the network, the various tables are slowly received and buffered until all of the required tables are assembled for use. Blatter specifically sets forth this transmission detail, as individual packets related to the different tables are received and buffered over time as they are identified (column 8, lines 37-

61), thus assembly the full PSI representative of all of the required table data (column 8, lines 58-61). Appellant's characterization of the transmission and storage of the PSI information is incorrect, as it goes against the basic transmission method utilized by the MPEG standard. Thus, as indicated in the rejection, the assembling of the "full PSI" as tables are received and buffered over time clearly meets the claim limitation of storing an index.

d. On pages 15-16, appellant argues that the combination of Blatter and Ohishi fail to disclose a recording section that would enable subsequent reproduction of the packet stream without first verifying the contents of the PMT and PAT.

In response, it is noted that neither Blatter or Ohishi require any "verifying" of the PMT and PAT tables in any fashion whatsoever. As both Blatter and Ohishi disclose reproducing the packet stream (see Blatter at column 12, lines 61-65 and Ohishi at column 12, line 31-column 13, line 26) without any verifying step taking place, they clearly meet the claim limitations. Appellant's opinion that both Blatter and Ohishi would require "verifying" is not supported by anything in the references, as neither recites any need for verifying.

Further, it is noted that the claim language does not require the system to reproduce content *without* verifying the PMT and PAT, the claims only require that subsequent reproduction of said packet stream "*may*" be performed without first verifying the contents of the PMT and PAT. A computer system reproducing



content utilizing PSI tables is clearly *capable* of performing the reproduction without verifying and would thus meet the current broad claim limitations.

e. On pages 15-16, appellant argues that the combination of Blatter and Ohishi fail to disclose a recording section for retaining the specific values.

In response, appellant is incorrect, as both Blatter and Ohishi specifically disclose the storing of the tables for the recorded program (see Ohishi at column 12, lines 11-14 and Blatter at column 11, lines 40-43 and lines 64-67). Thus, the specific values are retained in a recording section, as the tables themselves are clearly retained.

f. On pages 16-17, appellant argues that Blatter and Ohishi fail to disclose altering a program number.

In response, Ohishi explicitly discloses altering a plurality of program numbers, as a plurality of different PID values are altered to correspond to new default values (column 11, lines 30-42). Thus, appellant's assertion is incorrect, as a plurality of different program numbers are altered. As the claims do not define what program number is to be altered, Ohishi clearly reads upon the claim limitations.

g. On pages 17-20, appellant argues that Blatter and Ohishi are directed to different purposes, there is no motivation to combine the references and that

appellants invention solves an unrecognized problem of conventional systems resulting in reducing recording space.

In response,

i. Blatter and Ohishi are both specifically directed to similar purposes, as both are directed to modifying service tables to correspond to recorded programming.

ii. In regards to motivation, as indicated previously to appellant, the altering of the PID values in a PMT table, as taught by Ohishi help provide the explicit benefit of eliminating the need to modify a plurality of tables by creating a single default table. Furthermore, the altering of the PAT table is specifically disclosed as ensuring that convention STBs are capable of utilizing the stored tables without storing additional unneeded tables.

iii. Finally, in regards to the supposed unrecognized problem, it is noted that Blatter explicitly recognizes the problem of wasted recording space, and proposed his system as a means to reduce wasted overhead and storage space (column 8, lines 8-13).

h. In response to appellant's statements on page 18, lines 26-28, it is noted that the rejections are only based upon the combination of **two** prior art references, and not **four** as appellants suggests.

Art Unit: 2623

- i. In response to appellant's comments on page 20, please see above in regards to the details of the combination of Blatter and Ohishi.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.


For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,


JS

Conferees:

Chris Kelley

*FOR CHRIS KELLEY*  
  
JOHN MILLER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Scott Beliveau

  
SCOTT E. BELIVEAU  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER  
*Acting SPE*